

# CACC MEETING MINUTES

## COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, September 16, 2010  
10:00 AM - 12:00 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT  
1501 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007



AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: 1-602-425-3193  
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 1126#

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Kip Anderson\*  
Julie Dybas (*Randy Kennedy, proxy*)  
Joan Harphant\*  
Mary Hawkins\*  
Donald Jacobson  
Patrick McGrath  
Richard McHattie  
Rona Newton  
Patricia Noland  
Michael Pollard, *Chair*  
Rick Rager  
Paul Thomas

### GUESTS

Steve Ballance, *Pima Superior Court*  
Jessica Cortes, *Flagstaff Muni Court*  
Charles Drake, *PCCJC*  
Peter Kiefer, *Maricopa COSC*

### MEMBERS ABSENT

Cathy Clarich  
Timothy Dickerson  
Phillip Knox  
Doug Pilcher  
Lisa Royal

### AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*  
Bob Macon, *ITD*  
Adele May, *ITD*  
Christine Olea, *ITD*  
Pamela Peet, *ITD*  
Jim Price, *ITD*  
Renny Rapier, *ITD*

\* indicates appeared by telephone

## **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order just after 10:00 a.m. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed. The chair then distributed several updated copies of the latest MindMap and briefly previewed the upcoming discussion at COT on September 24 about changes in CACC's approach. He reminded members that the focus is on interdependencies rather than individual projects and not on grading the performance of any individual project or deliverable, but determining what items would benefit from CACC's help.

**MOTION:** A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the August 19, 2010. The motion passed unanimously.

## **TOOL TO INDICATE FUNCTIONALITY AND DEPENDENCIES**

Staff Member Stewart Bruner described the activities he's undertaken in relation to updating the MindMap since last meeting and considerations for making the map contents more accessible. He related some details of his conversation with Karl Heckart and concerns about the growing levels of detail and overall size of the map, as well as concern for the length of time required each month to perform the update process. Judge Pollard shared the strategy for describing the levels of dependencies to COT apart from the complete map. Members stated that they desired both an updated complete map and COT-style specific maps reflecting the critical areas for discussion each month.

Discussion returned to the strategy for updating the map each month and obtaining the required level of participation from individual project managers. The COT motion will be enhanced to include CACC's authority to obtain information from project managers at individual courts when necessary. The chair agreed with a suggestion to invite all the project managers represented on the map to the October meeting in order to share committee members' expectations and ensure their understanding.

Managers of COT strategic projects will be responsible for obtaining the input staff requires from the specific projects they depend on. Stewart displayed the Excel version of the MindMap that will be circulated for recording the updates. While every item on the map will be updated each month, the chair and staff will work together to determine which projects warrant a verbal update at the meeting. Members felt the project manager should be responsible to obtain the updates and return the spreadsheet to Stewart. Additionally, the project manager of a project depending on another was deemed the appropriate person to both decide what appears as a dependency on the map and bring a concern about the date or priority to CACC. Members requested the addition of two fields: "level of confidence" following the current end date row and a "concern/risk indicator" to alert staff to the critical items that need to be raised to CACC's attention. Staff will add an icon to the MindMap to indicate items labeled as concerns.

## **PACC UPDATE**

Rona Newton provided a brief recap of discussions at the August 27 Committee on Probation meeting. In that meeting, appointed chief probation officers recommitted to Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC) and a new, combined chief from La Paz County was added to membership. She outlined the repeatable process that will be used for soliciting

input about technology issues and feeding back information. PACC will continue meeting quarterly.

## **STATEWIDE E-FILING UPDATE**

Jim Price, e-Filing Project Manager at the AOC, continued to function as the test case for using the MindMap to deliver project updates. He focused on the few critical activities necessary to support Appellate e-Filing on November 1 by enabling limited integration between AZTurboCourt and the Appellamation case management system. His pacing item remains the completion of XML specifications in two remaining areas. Once these are worked out for Appellamation, they will be delivered to technical owners of other CMSs to begin crafting stored procedures to work with ROAM, the product that populates the central case index. Steve Ballance from Pima Superior Court mentioned that ROAM is not the only option his court is considering for delivery of case data. Jim added that Pima 's dates have slipped, in part as a result of the lack of an XML specification, and that he is working to obtain a committed date from Maricopa Justice Courts. Jim touched on the fact that TurboCourt requires data from the various case management systems and therefore a local project needs to exist for each. Members were concerned that Jim might have difficulty obtaining the necessary updates for those local projects and directed Stewart to include an aspect to address the concern in the proposed motion for COT.

Representatives from both Maricopa and Pima Superior Courts reminded Jim of their issues with the direction automated clerk review seems to be taking related to the TurboCourt software. Jim felt confident an e-Court policy discussion was in the works. Members discussed bulk filing versus single case filing and attorney versus pro se filing differences. Jim described the pressures being placed on the software to both hold filers harmless for time needed behind the scenes at the court and to simultaneously prevent "gaming of the system" by filers who submit an incomplete filing in order to meet a deadline, knowing the clerk cannot reject it. He reiterated that this is a policy issue not a technology issue.

Members had no questions for the other managers of strategic projects present and the managers had nothing to report this month.

## **POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS**

Pat McGrath shared his experience with supporting the AJACS 3.4.1 implementation in Globe at the Gila Superior Court location August 21. He pronounced it a very smooth transition and summarized a few of the technical difficulties. All but 2 of the 16 issues collected were resolved by the end of the weekend.

The next meeting will take place in **Room 106** of the **State Courts Building** on **October 21, 2010**. Dates are being reserved for 2011 CACC meetings and will be posted once determined.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.